

compound, e.g., in '867, suggests the exo compound of present claim 18.

However, as set forth in the accompanying Declaration under 37 CFR 1.132, Dr. Lichtenhan, a patentee in '867, states that his group was only able to prepare endo OH groups and not exo OH groups by the disclosed method of such patent. Such Declaration further states that such stereo-specific reaction has also been noted in the literature and cites same in his Declaration.

The Declaration goes on to state that not until the inventive method of present claim 18 were applicants able to produce the exo OH isomer. Accordingly it is believed that the above rejection, as to claim 18, is met.

As to the assertion by the Office Action that the two isomers, endo & exo, have similar properties, this has been determined not to be the case. That is, it has been found that the exo isomer has much higher reactivity because SiOH has less steric hindrance on the exo than on the endo isomer.

Thus it would appear evident that the product produced by the above two references does not inherently include the exo form of the claimed compound. Nor would the skilled artisan have found the exo form obvious over the endo form in view of the above stereo-specific reaction and difference in properties of the exo isomer.

The Office Action rejection of claims 20, 21 & 25, as anticipated under 35 USC 102 (b) or obvious under 35 USC 103 (a), over Lichtenhan et al ('562), is respectfully traversed.

As to these 3 claims, applicants maintain that the method of Lichtenhan '562 could not produce an expanded ring having an RR substituent because that method uses a different reagent. That is, '562 teaches the use of a single R reagent, Y_3SiR .

However, claim 20 of the present application uses a different reagent, i.e., Y_2SiRR and arrives at novel RR products such as recited in claim 25, which could not be produced by the '562 method, inherently or otherwise.

It is noted that claims 1-17 are considered allowed and that claims 22 to 24 and 26 to 29 would be allowable if...e.g., claim 20 were in allowable form. In view of the above discussion, it is believed claim 20 is novel over the cited art and imparts allowability to those dependent claims.

Accordingly, the claims as amended or otherwise discussed above, are believed distinguished over the prior art and in condition for allowance and the same is requested.

In accordance with section 714.01 of the M.P.E.P., the following information is presented in the event that a call may be deemed necessary by the Examiner: Thomas C. Stover, (781) 377-3779.

Respectfully submitted,



THOMAS C. STOVER
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No 22,351